

### **V. REMARKS**

Entry of the Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 because the Amendment: a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; b) does not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration because the Amendment amplifies issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; c) does not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and d) places the application in better form for appeal, should an Appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. The amendments to the subject claims do not incorporate any new subject matter into the claims. Thus, entry of the Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Goddard et al. (U.S. Patent 5,502,808) in view of Chang et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,618,773) and Lvovsky (U.S. Patent No. 5,159,683). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The difference between Goddard and the present invention lies in what is stored in the storage means. While the reference stores image data in the storage means, the present invention stores specification information (EDID) in the storage means. There is an outstanding difference in this respect.

Furthermore, Goddard is clearly different in not having the determining means of this invention. The reference discloses two signal sources, "GRAPHICS PROCESSOR" and "VGA HARDWARE SUB SYSTEM". However, Goddard neither discloses nor suggests a means for distinguishing between these signal sources.

While the present invention is a technique applicable within a display apparatus, Goddard teaches a technique applicable within a PC. Thus, Goddard does not provide a construction for transmitting contents of the storage means from a display to a PC.

There is a remarkable difference between Chang and the present invention in the construction of the input interface in the monitor. The display apparatus of Chang is a dual interface monitor having an analog interface which can receive only analog video signals, and a digital interface which can receive only digital video

signals. On the other hand, the interface of this invention can receive analog video signals and digital video signals. This invention is characterized by determining which video signal is inputted to the, interface and providing a PC with an appropriate EDID.

Such a subject matter is irrelevant to Chang having the physically different input interfaces. The reference seems to determine to which interface a cable is connected, and provides the PC with an appropriate EDID.

Lvovsky is different from the present invention in what is identified. That is, Lvovsky identifies a display apparatus, whereas the present invention identifies an interface connected to the display apparatus. Lvovsky has the feature common to the present invention that a determination is made by using a signal line between a display and a PC, but is completely different in construction and subject matter.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the applied art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of claim 1 for the reasons discussed above. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the features of the applied art because such combination would not result in the claimed invention. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the applied art.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is allowable at least for the reason claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features it recites.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. Claims 2, 4-8, 10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard in view of Chang and Lvovsky as applied to claim 1 and in view of the technical publication entitled "Digital Visual Interface DVI." The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action cites "Digital Visual Interface DVI" to show that a DVI interface, a display data channel and a DC current circuit are known in the art.

It is respectfully submitted that, as discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Goddard, Chang and Lvovsky. It is respectfully submitted that the technical publication fails to cure the deficiencies of Goddard, Chang and Lvovsky and therefore claim 1 is allowable over the combination of these references. Claims 2, 4-8 and 10 depend from claim 1 and include all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is

respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable for at least the reasons that claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Claim 16, as amended, is directed to a display apparatus for displaying images based on signals received from a host that includes a peak hold circuit and output means that includes a multiplexer. Claim 16 recites that the peak hold circuit generates a DC voltage based on synchronizing signals received from a host with the DC voltage generated by the peak hold circuit being supplied only to the storage means for a VGA interface and to the multiplexer.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the applied art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the features of claim 16. Specifically, it is respectfully submitted that none of the applied art, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests a peak hold circuit that generates a DC voltage based on synchronizing signals received from a host with the DC voltage generated by the peak hold circuit being supplied only to the storage means for a VGA interface and to the multiplexer. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine the features of the applied art because such combination would not result in the claimed invention. As a result, it is respectfully submitted that claim 16 is allowable over the applied art.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the features of claim 16 have already been examined. Therefore, no new issues have been raised in claim 16 that would require further search and/or consideration by the Examiner.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Goddard in view of Chang and Lvovsky as applied to claim 1 and in view of Gradinariu (U.S. Patent No. 6,378,008). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Gradinariu teaches an output data path scheme in a memory device that includes a feedforward portion configured to drive a data signal from a selected local bus line onto a global bus and a feedback portion configured to drive the data signal from the global bus onto a deselected local bus line. A first sense amplifier drives the data signal onto the selected local bus line. A second sense amplifier is coupled to the deselected local bus line.

It is respectfully submitted that, as discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Goddard, Chang and Lvovsky. It is respectfully submitted that Gradinariu fails to

cure the deficiencies of Goddard, Chang and Lvovsky and therefore claim 1 is allowable over the combination of these references. Claim 3 depends from claim 1 and includes all of the features of claim 1. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claim is allowable at least for the reasons claim 1 is allowable as well as for the features it recites.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.


In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 10, 2004

By:



David T. Nikaido  
Reg. No. 22,663

Carl Schaukowitch  
Reg. No. 29,211

**RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC**  
1233 20<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W. Suite 501  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Tel: (202) 955-3750  
Fax: (202) 955-3751  
Customer No. 23353